



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten signature]

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/866,082 | 05/25/2001 | Shusaku Okamoto | 5077-000046 | 6866 |

27572 7590 07/29/2004

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

YE, LIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2615

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

[Handwritten mark]

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/866,082

Applicant(s)

OKAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Lin Ye

Art Unit

2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 10-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6.7.8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al. J.P. Publication 08-048198.

Referring to claim 1, the Watanabe reference discloses in Drawings 7-13, an image processor comprising an image processing section (image synthesizer unit 22), which receives multiple images that have been taken by cameras (two or more cameras 21) mounted on a vehicle to monitor surroundings of the vehicle, generates a synthesized image from the multiple images and outputs the synthesized image to a display device (See Detailed description [0021]), wherein the image processing section switches (by display switch judging equipment 16) display modes (a **perimeter fixed display mode** where the surroundings are fixed and the vehicle moves in normal condition; or a **perimeter revolution display mode** where the vehicle is fixed and the surroundings are turned in the) of the synthesized image in accordance with a state of a movable part of the vehicle (e.g., wheel speed and steering angle of the car, see [0024]-[0026]).

Referring to claim 11, the Watanabe reference discloses wherein the movable part comprises at least tires of the vehicle, and wherein the image processing section switches the display modes of the synthesized image in accordance with a steering angle of wheels on which the tires are fitted (see [0026]-[0028]).

Referring to claim 12, the Watanabe reference discloses all subject matter as discussed in respected claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. J.P. Publication 08-048198 in view of Kanuma et al. EP. Publication 0700212 A1.

Referring to claim 10, the Watababe reference discloses all subject matter as discussed in respected claim 1, except that the reference does not explicitly show a movable part comprises at least doors, hood and trunk of the vehicle instead of wheel and steering of the vehicle; and image switches the display modes of the synthesized image in accordance with opening and closing of the doors, hood or trunk.

The Kanuma reference discloses in Figures 11-12, the cameras CMR1, CMR2, CML1, and CML2 are mounted on the vehicle doors DRR1, DRR2, DRL1 and DRL2

(see Col. 8, lines 20-25); the image processing section (main CPU 5) switches the display modes in accordance with opening and closing of the doors, for example if the right said door DRR1 or DRR2 has been opened, the main CPU 5 causes the image picked up by the camera CMR1 or CMR2 to be displayed on the monitor (4, see Col. 8, lines 52-56). The Takagi reference is evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see more advantages for car monitoring system can switch the display modes accordance with opening and closing of the doors so that the passengers can receive information necessary for the safety check (See Col. 2, lines 35-39). For that reason, it would have been obvious to see the car monitoring system comprising a image processing section switches the display modes of the synthesized image in accordance with opening and closing of the doors, hood or trunk disclosed by Suzuki.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 2-9 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a car monitoring system comprising: multiple cameras, mounted on a vehicle; an image processing section generates a synthesized image from the images taking by cameras; and wherein if a change in the state of the movable part of the vehicle has altered the position or direction of at least one of the cameras to make the synthesized image unnatural, the image processing

section switches the display modes of the synthesized image from a normal mode into an alert mode.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - a. Kumamoto J.P. Publication 10-257482 discloses that to provide the left, right and rear road conditions as continuous information and to instantaneously grasp the entire conditions.
 - b. Waters U.S. 6,396,535 discloses a situation awareness system includes a plurality of cameras mounted on the vehicle.
 - c. Lee U.S. 5,680,123 discloses the vehicle monitoring system uses a plurality of video cameras mounted on various locations.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Lin Ye** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3250**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Christensen can be reached on (703) 308-9644.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks


Washington, DC. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



ANDREW CHRISTENSEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Lin Ye
July 22, 2004